

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/987,709

Applicant(s)

MURRAY, JOHN C.

Examiner

R. Alexander Smith

Art Unit

2859

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) R. Alexander Smith.(3) Diego Gutierrez.(2) Jack S Barufka.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.


Claim(s) discussed: 1-11.Identification of prior art discussed: Rutty et al. and Nagasawa et al.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant will submit a supplemental response further expanding on the criticality of the dimensions including the material composition, the height, the standout and, in particularity, the readability in combination with the width.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required 3/26/03